

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Mary Sequin

v.

Civil No. 13-cv-095-JNL-LM

Hon. Paul Suttell et al.

SUMMARY ORDER

After due consideration of the objections filed, I herewith approve the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Landya B. McCafferty dated October 3, 2013. The defendants' motion for a temporary stay (document no. 34) is accordingly GRANTED, and the court imposes, in this case, a narrowly-tailored filing restriction upon the plaintiff, as set forth below:

1. Plaintiff is ordered to cease filing any motions, pleadings, notices, or other documents after the date of this order, until the district court rules on the defendants' September 5, 2013, motion to dismiss (document no. 46), except as follows:
 - a. Plaintiff may file **one** objection or other response to each motion filed by defendants while this filing restriction remains in effect, within the time allowed by LR Cv 7(b);
 - b. Plaintiff may file **one** objection or other response to the defendants' motion to dismiss (document no. 46) while this filing restriction remains in effect, within the time allowed by this court's prior orders;
 - c. If the magistrate judge issues a report and recommendation on the defendants' motion to dismiss (document no. 46), plaintiff may file **one** objection to that order and **one** response to any other party's objection, as provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and LR Cv 72.2;

- d. If the magistrate judge issues an order as to any nondispositive matter while this filing restriction remains in effect, plaintiff may file **one** objection to that order and **one** response to any other party's objection, as provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and LR Cv 72.2;
 - e. Plaintiff may file a motion to extend the deadlines set forth herein, demonstrating good cause for extending those deadlines; and
 - f. Plaintiff may file a motion seeking the court's leave to file another document, in accordance with Paragraph 2 below.
- 2. Except as to the motions, objections, and responses listed in Paragraphs 1(a)-(f) of this order, which plaintiff may file without first seeking the court's leave, the court may, while this filing restriction remains in effect, summarily deny any motion and/or strike any document filed by plaintiff, unless plaintiff simultaneously files a motion seeking the court's leave to file that document or motion. In her motion seeking such leave to file, plaintiff must demonstrate the basis upon which she asserts a right or need to file the document or motion at issue, and must attach the document or motion she proposes to file as an exhibit to the motion requesting leave.
 - 3. Unless otherwise ordered by this court, defendants need not respond to any notice, pleading, or motion currently pending, or filed by plaintiff after the date of this order, while this filing restriction remains in effect.
 - 4. Unless otherwise ordered by this court, the conditions and restrictions set forth in Paragraphs 1-3 of this order shall terminate when the district judge either rules on the defendants' motion to dismiss (document no. 46), or accepts, rejects, or modifies the magistrate judge's report and recommendation on that motion, whichever occurs first.

The court has also given due consideration to the plaintiff's motions to vacate this court's July 2, 2013 order designating Magistrate Judge McCafferty to hear and determine all

pretrial matters, as well as motions to dismiss and for summary judgment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Finding no basis for the plaintiff's allegations of bias on Magistrate Judge McCafferty's part, the court DENIES those motions (documents nos. 74, 92).

SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joe Laplante", is written over a horizontal line.

Joseph N. Laplante
United States District Judge

Dated: December 17, 2013

cc: Mary Seguin (pro se)
Rebecca Tedford Partington, Esq.
Susan E. Urso, Esq.